

REMARKS

Applicants have studied the Office Action dated June 21, 2004, and have made amendments to the claims, specification and drawings. Specifically, claims 5 and 8-11, various parts of the specification and Fig. 1 have been amended. No new matter has been added. It is respectfully submitted that the application, as amended, is in condition for allowance. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Objections to the Drawings

The drawings were objected to because Figs. 3B and 3C were not described in the specification. In lieu of canceling Figs. 3B and 3C in the drawings, the paragraph beginning on page 6, line 25 was amended to identify Figs. 3B and 3C in the description. Applicant does not believe that such an amendment constitutes new matter because it merely clarifies the description by referencing the appropriate figure. Accordingly, Applicant submits that the objection be withdrawn.

The drawings were also objected to because the elements "user menu registration button," "deletion button," "confirm key," and "remote control signal receiving circuit," as specified in the claims were not shown in the drawings. In response, Fig. 1 has been amended (please see the attached replacement sheet) to specify a "user registration button" as element 160, a "confirm key" as element 170 and a "deletion button" as element 180 on the remote control 110. Support for the remote control 110 including the user registration button, confirm key and deletion button can be found in the description at the paragraph beginning on page 4, line 5, the paragraph beginning on page 6, line 25 and the paragraph beginning on page 7, line 7, respectively. Furthermore, Fig. 1 has been amended (please see the attached replacement sheet) to specify a "remote control signal receiving circuit" as element 190 in the microcomputer 120. Support for this can be found in the description at the paragraph beginning on page 4, line 20. Accordingly, no new matter has been added by these amendments. The specification has also been amended to reflect element numbers 160, 170, 180 and 190. In view of this, Applicant respectfully submits that the objections be withdrawn.

Amendment to the Drawings

The attached sheet of drawings includes changes to Fig. 1. This sheet replaces the original sheet including Fig. 1. In Figure 1, previously omitted elements 160, 170, 180 and 190 have been added. No new matter has been added.

Attachment: Replacement Sheet
Annotated Sheet Showing Changes

Objections to the Specification

The disclosure was objected to because "CPC" on page 5, line 15 should be --CPT--. Furthermore, "CTP" on page 5, line 23 should be --CPT--. In response, Applicant has amended the specification to comply with the Examiner's suggestions. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests the objections be withdrawn.

Objections to the Claims

Claims 5, 8, 9 and 11 were objected to because of informalities. In response, Applicant has amended claims 5, 8, 9 and 11 to comply with the Examiner's suggestions. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests the objections be withdrawn.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 9-11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,999,228 to Matsuura ("Matsuura"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

A proper rejection for anticipation under § 102 requires complete identity of invention. The claimed invention, including each element thereof as recited in the claims, must be disclosed or embodied, either expressly or inherently, in a single reference. Scripps Clinic & Research Found. v. Genentech Inc., 927 F.2d 1565, 1576, 18 U.S.P.Q.2d 1001, 1010 (Fed. Cir. 1991); Standard Havens Prods., Inc. v. Gencor Indus., Inc., 953 F.2d 1360, 1369, 21 U.S.P.Q.2d 1321, 1328 (Fed. Cir. 1991).

Independent claim 9 has been amended to specify the graphics processing unit actuating a corresponding menu item when an optional item is selected among the user menu. Claim 9 has further been amended to recite a remote control having a deletion button for deleting a menu item from the user menu. Such limitations are neither taught nor suggested by Matsuura. Furthermore, Applicant respectfully submits that these limitations are part of a combination found to be allowable over the prior art as stated by the Examiner on page 5, paragraph 6 of the Office Action. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the rejection of claim 9 be withdrawn and the claim be allowed. Because claims 10 and 11 depend from claim 9, Applicant further submits that the dependent claims are in condition for allowance.

It is noted with appreciation that claims 1-8 were indicated as being allowed. Claims 5 and 8 have been amended to improve their form. It is believed that the amendments do not introduce new matter in the application.

CONCLUSION

In light of the above remarks, Applicant submits that the present Amendment places all claims of the present application in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the application, as amended, is requested.

No amendment made was related to the statutory requirements of patentability unless expressly stated herein; and no amendment made was for the purpose of narrowing the scope of any claim, unless Applicant has argued herein that such amendment was made to distinguish over a particular reference or combination of references.

If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at the Los Angeles, California, telephone number (213) 623-2221 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

Lee, Hong, Degerman, Kang & Schmadeka

Date: December 21, 2004

By: Lew Macapagal
Lew Edward E. Macapagal
Registration No. 55,146
Attorney for Applicant(s)

Customer No. 035884

Lee, Hong, Degerman, Kang & Schmadeka
801 S. Figueroa Street, 14th Floor
Los Angeles, California 90017
Telephone: 213-623-2221
Facsimile: 213-623-2211



Application No. 10/005,425
Reply To Office Action of June 21, 2004
Annotated Sheet Showing Changes

